UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/586,524	10/23/2006	Derek I. Darley	22409-00273-US	4660	
	7590 12/14/2007 BOVE LODGE & HUTZ L	מ ז	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STR		LF	BOCKELMAN, MARK		
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTO	N. DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3766		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/586,524	DARLEY ET AL.	
Office Acti	on Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	·	Mark W. Bockelman	3766	
The MAILING DA	ATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
WHICHEVER IS LONG  - Extensions of time may be av after SIX (6) MONTHS from the second of the second	GER, FROM THE MAILING allable under the provisions of 37 CFR he mailing date of this communication. fied above, the maximum statutory perior extended period for reply will, by stace later than three months after the maximum.	B DATE OF THIS COMMUI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) M tute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1) Responsive to co	ommunication(s) filed on 28	3 September 2007.		
2a) ☐ This action is FIN	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application	•		atters, prosecution as to the ments is	s
	ance with the practice unde		·	
Disposition of Claims			•	
- -	are pending in the applicati	on.		
· , , ——	claim(s) is/are withd			
5) Claim(s) i				
6)☐ Claim(s) i				
7) Claim(s) is	s/are objected to.			
	e subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers				
9) The specification	is objected to by the Exami	iner.		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ed on is/are: a)□ a		o by the Examiner.	
	request that any objection to t		<del>-</del>	•
			ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(	<b>d)</b> .
			ed Office Action or form PTO-152.	,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment	is made of a claim for forei	ign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)	e * c)□ None of:	•		
1. ☐ Certified c	opies of the priority docume	ents have been received.		
2. Certified c	opies of the priority docume	ents have been received in	Application No	
3. Copies of	the certified copies of the pa	riority documents have bee	en received in this National Stage	
	from the International Bure	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
* See the attached of	detailed Office action for a li	ist of the certified copies no	ot received.	
Attachment(s)	(DTO 800)	<b>" —</b>		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Page 1</li> </ol>			v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Stat	- ,	5) 🔲 Notice o	f Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		6)	<del></del> ·	

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, 19, drawn to a speech processor and housing and case, classified in class 607, subclass 57.
- II. Claims 10-13, drawn to a case for containing a speech processor, classified in class 206, subclass 438.
- III. Claims 14-17, drawn to a speech processor and housing, classified in class 704, subclass 200.
- IV. Claim 18, drawn to a speech processor, classified in class 704, subclass200.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I as compared to II-IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination (IV) as claimed because It does not require the case with a cover and does not require an interface with a speech processor, only that it be capable of such. With respect to group II, the combination does not require the speech processor housing to be configured to mate with two

different connectors or to have an operationional mode adjustment. The subcombination has separate utility such as speech processors and casing for interacting with different components.

Inventions s III and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination housing and connectors do not require the mode selector. The subcombination has separate utility such as being used in a single mode device.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in

scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination casing has separate utility such as for containing other articles besides a speech processor. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02). restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark W. Bockelman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4941. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Layno can be reached on (571) 272 -4949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**MWB** 

December 10, 2007

MARK BOCKELMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER